

**Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission
Committee of the Whole
Wednesday August 14, 2013
Crown Roller Mill Building**

***Unapproved* Minutes**

Commissioners Present: Mariah Levison, Brittany Lewis, Jeff Strand, Ishmael Israel, Carol Pass, Andres Hortillosa

Staff Present: Robert Thompson, Howard Blin

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 PM by Ishmael Israel (Committee Chair)

Agenda

1. Community Participation Program Guidelines

Thompson described the background of the [Community Participation Program \(CPP\) in a slide presentation](#) (pdf). Thompson gave an overview of the former Neighborhood Revitalization Program, the Framework for the Future, and CPP development process from 2010. NCR and NCEC were told that neighborhood organizations wanted stable funding and a stable program. The various evaluations that were conducted of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) were also described. For some of these evaluations an oversight committee was used. Robert Thompson described the 3 Core Program Purposes, discussed eligible expenses, standards and expectations, and NCR support for neighborhood organizations including audit, insurance, legal, grievance and appeals processes. A slide showed the Consolidated Tax Increment Funding over 10 years (including captured Phase II NRP funds).

- NCR to develop a basic powerpoint presentation on CPP funding that NCEC commissioners can have available as a tool to work with neighborhoods
- NCR staff to research and provide links to available Neighborhood Revitalization Plan evaluations
- Robert Thompson reviewed several prior evaluations of the NRP program (e.g. Teamworks 2001, CURA 2006). Some of the methodology used included stakeholders review, database review, review of Neighborhood Action Plans from NRP, used an evaluation oversight committee. In evaluation the use of independent evaluators is key. Comment made that strong neighborhood involvement, consultation and review of proposed changes is key.

Comments from Commissioners:

- Since the amount of funding for the CPP derived from the Consolidated Tax Increment Financing District is limited, other sources of neighborhood funding should be explored such as earmarking funds in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
- Demonstrating the effects of the NRP by showing improving neighborhood trends has been very effective at the legislature.
- It was asked if neighborhood organizations had concerns about the ability to rollover unspent CPP funds from one funding cycle to the next? Thompson replied that now that the program is on the third funding cycle, neighborhoods are getting more comfortable with their ability to roll over funding.
- There was no public input on the soon to be released guidelines for the upcoming funding cycle. Thompson responded that there was a great deal of input from neighborhoods in previous funding cycles. One of the clear recommendations from neighborhoods has been that program have stability, including the guidelines.
- As part of the NCEC's acceptance to go ahead with the guidelines without Commission review was to get the NCEC more involved in the CPP. It is important that the Neighborhood and Community Relation (NCR) Department come forward with proposals to bring the Commission closer to the program. Since NCEC members are volunteering their time, there is a need to make productive use of the time of these highly qualified and engaged volunteers.
- The Commission should stay at the level of policy development and leave program administration to staff. One commissioner was concerned that CPP plan review at the neighborhood level was too granular.
- There is a need to build the relationship between the Commission and the NCR, there should be fixed things in place regarding NCEC involvement in the CPP. Thompson responded that the Commission should be provided with all the CPP applications and Neighborhood Priority Plans.
 - Can NCR neighborhood specialists generate CPP application evaluations and summaries that could be made available to the Commission as a way to bring NCEC closer to the process without inundating commissioners with CPP application details?
 - NCR staff shared that it may not be appropriate or desired by the respective neighborhood councils to have specifics of the challenges faced by individual neighborhoods shared with the Commission.

- If there was a better understanding of the process of evaluating CPP applications and clarification of the funding formula, the increased transparency in the program would increase support for the program and less skepticism from the NCEC as well as the respective neighborhood councils.

A commissioner commented about the need for trust and transparency, the need for clarification on the funding formula, consider what role At-Large members can serve in the program (e.g. have designated neighborhoods?).

- Commissioners discussed connections between the CPP and the Blueprint for equity effort.
 - How does the Blueprint for Equity affect CPP guidelines? Thompson responded that they are separate.
 - A commissioner commented that the Blueprint for Equity discussions may not be full if neighborhoods cannot make suggestions on whether or not their elected commissioners can review/have input on CPP guidelines and CPP application reviews

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM.

Submitted by Howard Blin